



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,426	10/30/2001	Martin DeGeorge	MATP-607US	2073

23122 7590 08/27/2003

RATNERPRESTIA
P O BOX 980
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2697

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CA

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,426

Applicant(s)

DEGEORGE, MARTIN

Examiner

Md S Elahee

Art Unit

2697

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments mailed on 06/24/03 have been fully considered but they are not fully persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3, 6, 13, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,650).

Regarding claim 1, Hansen teaches a voice mail system that receives the audio message (abstract; col.6, lines 41-54; 'voice mail system' reads on the claim 'answering machine module' and 'message' reads on the claim 'messages').

Hansen further teaches converting the DTMF tones to text matching respective individual keys on a telephone keypad (fig.13; col.17, lines 32-43; 'converting' reads on the claim 'a DTMF tone decoder which converts').

Hansen further teaches a mailbox (abstract; col.6, lines 41-64; 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Hansen further teaches recording the audio message and the text corresponding to the DTMF tones into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'a processor that stores', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'received audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Regarding claim 3, Hansen further teaches recording the audio message corresponding the text into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'a processor that stores', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'the speech signals in place of the DTMF tones in the respective audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Regarding claim 6, Hansen teaches a voice mail system including a display phone and inherently an audio output port, whereby the audio message are provided to the playback key and the respective stored text is provided to the display phone for displaying to a caller (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'voice mail system' reads on the claim 'telephone answering machine', 'display phone' reads on the claim 'display output port', 'message' reads on the claim 'messages', 'displaying' reads on the claim 'concurrent presentation' and 'caller' reads on the claim 'user').

Regarding claim 13, Hansen teaches receiving the audio message (abstract; col.6, lines 41-54; 'audio message' reads on the claim 'telephone audio messages').

Hansen further teaches converting the DTMF tones to text matching respective individual keys on a telephone keypad (fig.13; col.17, lines 32-43). Thus, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2697

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow converting the DTMF tones to text as taught by Hansen. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide the message in text format.

Hansen further teaches recording the audio message and the text corresponding to the DTMF tones into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'storing', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'received audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Regarding claim 15, Hansen further teaches recording the audio message corresponding the text into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'a processor that stores', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'the speech signals in place of the DTMF tones in the respective audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Regarding claim 16, Hansen teaches dialing a number by providing stored text (fig.18; col.19, lines 65-67, col.20, lines 1-67, col.21, lines 1-67, col.22, lines 1-31; 'dialing a number' reads on the claim 'initiating a telephone call' and 'text' reads on the claim 'DTMF tones corresponding to one of the received audio messages to a telecommunications network').

Regarding claim 18, Hansen teaches providing the audio message (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64; 'audio message' reads on the claim 'audio messages as an audio output signal').

Hansen further teaches displaying stored text corresponding to audio message as the respective audio message is provided (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,650) and in view of McNutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,805,207).

Regarding claim 2, Hansen fails to teach “text-to-speech conversion means which converts the text to speech signals”. McNutt teaches software routines converting the text to speech parameter (col.4, lines 44-67, col.5, lines 1-13; ‘software routines’ reads on the claim ‘text-to-speech conversion means’ and ‘speech parameter’ reads on the claim ‘speech signals’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow text-to-speech conversion means as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the text-to-speech conversion means in order to provide the speech signal.

Hansen further teaches recording the audio message corresponding the text into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; ‘recording’ reads on the claim ‘a processor that stores’, ‘audio message’ reads on the claim ‘speech signals with the respective audio messages’ and ‘mailbox’ reads on the claim ‘storage device’).

Regarding claim 14, Hansen fails to teach “converting the text to speech signals”. McNutt teaches converting the text to speech parameter (col.4, lines 44-67, col.5, lines 1-13; ‘speech

Art Unit: 2697

parameter' reads on the claim 'speech signals'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow text-to-speech conversion means as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the text-to-speech conversion means in order to provide the speech signal.

Hansen further teaches recording the audio message corresponding the text into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'a processor that stores', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'speech signals with the respective audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

6. Claims 4, 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,650) and in view of McNutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,805,207) and further in view of Tverskoy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,160).

Regarding claim 4, Hansen fails to teach "a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands to the processor". McNutt teaches telephone interface for providing commands (col.6, lines 50-67; 'telephone interface' reads on the claim 'a user interface, coupled to the processor' and 'commands' reads on the claim 'user commands to the processor'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the user interface for providing user commands in order to retrieve the stored message.

Hansen in view of McNutt further fails to teach "an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN)". Tverskoy teaches an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN) (fig.1; col.2, lines 5-38). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2697

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of McNutt to allow an interface as taught by Tverskoy. The motivation for the modification is to have the interface in order to provide communication between different communication entities.

Hansen further fails to teach “the processor is responsive to a command provided via the user interface to retrieve the DTMF tones from the storage device”. McNutt teaches commands provided via telephone interface to retrieve message from the memory (abstract; col.5, lines 51-65, col.6, lines 39-67, col.7, lines 1-5; ‘commands’ reads on the claim ‘the processor is responsive to a command’, ‘telephone interface’ reads on the claim ‘a user interface’ and ‘message from the memory’ reads on the claim ‘DTMF tones from the storage device’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow the processor responsive to a command as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the command provided via the user interface in order to retrieve the stored message.

Hansen further teaches providing the text to dial a number (fig.18; col.19, lines 65-67, col.20, lines 1-67, col.21, lines 1-67, col.22, lines 1-31; ‘text’ reads on the claim ‘DTMF tones to the PSTN interface’ and ‘dial a number’ reads on the claim ‘initiate a telephone call’).

Regarding claim 5, Hansen fails to teach “a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands to the processor”. McNutt teaches telephone interface for providing commands (col.6, lines 50-67; ‘telephone interface’ reads on the claim ‘a user interface, coupled to the processor’ and ‘commands’ reads on the claim ‘user commands to the processor’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands

Art Unit: 2697

as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the user interface for providing user commands in order to retrieve the stored message.

Hansen in view of McNutt further fails to teach “an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN)”. Tverskoy teaches an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN) (fig.1; col.2, lines 5-38). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of McNutt to allow an interface as taught by Tverskoy. The motivation for the modification is to have the interface in order to provide communication between different communication entities.

Hansen further fails to teach “a DTMF tone generator configured to translate text numbers into DTMF tones”. McNutt teaches a DTMF generator circuit to convert text into DTMF signals (abstract; col.4, lines 44-68, col.5, lines 1-30; ‘DTMF generator circuit’ reads on the claim ‘DTMF tone generator configured’, ‘convert’ reads on the claim ‘translate’ and ‘text into DTMF signals’ reads on the claim ‘text numbers into DTMF tones’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow the DTMF tone generator to translate text numbers into DTMF tones as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the DTMF tone generator in order to provide the telephone number to the callee.

Hansen further teaches providing the text to dial a number (fig.18; col.19, lines 65-67, col.20, lines 1-67, col.21, lines 1-67, col.22, lines 1-31; ‘text’ reads on the claim ‘the translated DTMF tones to the PSTN interface’ and ‘dial a number’ reads on the claim ‘initiate a telephone call’).

Hansen further fails to teach “the processor is responsive to a command provided via the user interface to retrieve the text corresponding to the DTMF tones from the storage device and to provide the retrieved text to the DTMF tone generator”. McNutt teaches commands provided via telephone interface to retrieve message from the memory and to provide the retrieved message to DTMF generator circuit (abstract; col.4, lines 44-68, col.5, lines 1-30, 51-65, col.6, lines 39-67, col.7, lines 1-5; ‘commands’ reads on the claim ‘the processor is responsive to a command’, ‘telephone interface’ reads on the claim ‘a user interface’, ‘message from the memory’ reads on the claim ‘text corresponding to the DTMF tones from the storage device’ and ‘DTMF generator circuit’ reads on the claim ‘DTMF tone generator configured’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow the processor responsive to a command as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the command provided via the user interface in order to retrieve the stored message to make a call.

Regarding claim 17, Hansen further fails to teach “converting the stored text corresponding to one of the received audio messages to DTMF tones”. McNutt teaches converting text into DTMF signals (abstract; col.4, lines 44-68, col.5, lines 1-30; ‘text into DTMF signals’ reads on the claim ‘the stored text corresponding to one of the received audio messages to DTMF tones’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen to allow the DTMF tone generator to convert text to DTMF tones as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the conversion in order to provide the telephone number to the callee.

Art Unit: 2697

Hansen further teaches dialing a number by providing the stored text (fig.18; col.19, lines 65-67, col.20, lines 1-67, col.21, lines 1-67, col.22, lines 1-31; 'dialing a number' reads on the claim 'initiating a telephone call' and 'stored text' reads on the claim 'converted DTMF tones to a telecommunications network').

7. Claims 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,650) and in view of Schindler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,467).

Regarding claim 7, Hansen fails to teach "video processing circuitry". Schindler teaches video driver (col.3, lines 38-67, col.21, lines 49-67, col.22, lines 1-14; 'video driver' reads on the claim 'video processing circuitry'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler to allow a video processing circuitry as taught by Schindler. The motivation for the modification is to have the video processing circuitry in order to process video signals.

Hansen further fails to teach "audio processing circuitry". Schindler teaches audio processing circuit (col.3, lines 38-67, col.21, lines 49-67, col.22, lines 1-14; 'audio processing circuit' reads on the claim 'audio processing circuitry'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler to allow an audio processing circuitry as taught by Schindler. The motivation for the modification is to have the audio processing circuitry in order to process audio signals.

Hansen teaches a voice mail system that receives the audio message (abstract; col.6, lines 41-54; 'voice mail system' reads on the claim 'a telecommunications unit, including answering machine module' and 'message' reads on the claim 'messages').

Hansen further teaches converting the DTMF tones to text (fig.13; col.17, lines 32-43; 'converting' reads on the claim 'a DTMF tone decoder which converts' and 'DTMF tones' reads on the claim 'DTMF tones in the received audio messages').

Hansen further teaches a mailbox (abstract; col.6, lines 41-64; 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Hansen further teaches recording the audio message and the text corresponding to the DTMF tones into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'a processor which stores', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'received audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Hansen further fails to teach "replays the stored messages using the audio processing circuitry". Schindler teaches playing audio output using the audio processing circuit for audio output (col.21, lines 49-67, col.22, lines 1-14; 'playing audio output' reads on the claim 'replays the stored messages' and 'audio processing circuit' reads on the claim 'audio processing circuitry'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler to replay the stored messages using the audio processing circuitry as taught by Schindler. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to play the recorded message.

Hansen further fails to teach "displays the text using the video processing circuitry". Schindler teaches displaying the data using video driver (abstract; col.3, lines 42-67, col.21, lines 49-67, col.22, lines 1-14; 'data' reads on the claim 'text' and 'video driver' reads on the claim 'video processing circuitry'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler to display the text using the video

processing circuitry as taught by Schindler. The motivation for the modification is to have the display in order to provide the text message.

Regarding claim 12, Hansen further fails to teach “including a display output port for providing for display video signals received by the IRD set-top box and an audio output port for presenting sound signals associated with the displayed video signals, whereby the stored audio messages are provided to the audio output port and the respective stored text is provided to the display output port for concurrent presentation to a user”. Schindler further teaches including a data quality monitor for providing display video signal and an audio processing circuit for presenting audio data associated with the displayed video signals, whereby the audio data are provided to the audio processing circuit and the respective data is provided to the data quality monitor for concurrent presentation to a user (abstract; col.3, lines 42-67, col.21, lines 49-67, col.22, lines 1-14; ‘data quality monitor’ reads on the claim ‘display output port’, ‘video signal’ reads on the claim ‘video signal received by the IRD set-top box’, ‘audio processing circuit’ reads on the claim ‘audio output port’, ‘audio data’ reads on the claim ‘sound signals’, ‘audio data’ reads on the claim ‘stored audio messages’ and ‘data’ reads on the claim ‘stored text’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schindler to include a display output port for providing for display video signals received by the IRD set-top box and an audio output port for presenting sound signals associated with the displayed video signals, whereby the stored audio messages are provided to the audio output port and the respective stored text is provided to the display output port for concurrent presentation to a user as taught by Schindler. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the concurrent presentation to a user.

Art Unit: 2697

8. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,650) and in view of Schindler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,467) and further in view of McNutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,805,207).

Regarding claim 8, Hansen in view of Schindler fails to teach "text-to-speech conversion means which converts the text to speech signals". McNutt teaches software routines converting the text to speech parameter (col.4, lines 44-67, col.5, lines 1-13; 'software routines' reads on the claim 'text-to-speech conversion means' and 'speech parameter' reads on the claim 'speech signals'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of Schindler to allow text-to-speech conversion means as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the text-to-speech conversion means in order to provide the speech signal.

Hansen teaches recording the audio message corresponding to the text into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'a processor stores', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'the speech signals with the respective audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

Regarding claim 9, Hansen teaches recording the audio message into a mailbox (abstract; fig.13; col.6, lines 41-64, col.17, lines 32-43; 'recording' reads on the claim 'the processor is configured to store', 'audio message' reads on the claim 'speech signals in place of the DTMF tones in the respective audio messages' and 'mailbox' reads on the claim 'storage device').

9. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,650) and in view of Schindler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,467) and

Art Unit: 2697

further in view of McNutt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,805,207) and further in view of Tverskoy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,160).

Regarding claim 10, Hansen in view of Schindler fails to teach “a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands to the processor”. McNutt teaches telephone interface for providing commands (col.6, lines 50-67; ‘telephone interface’ reads on the claim ‘a user interface, coupled to the processor’ and ‘commands’ reads on the claim ‘user commands to the processor’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of Schindler to allow a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the user interface for providing user commands in order to retrieve the stored message.

Hansen in view of Schindler further in view of McNutt further fails to teach “an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN)”. Tverskoy teaches an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN) (fig.1; col.2, lines 5-38). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of Schindler further in view of McNutt to allow an interface as taught by Tverskoy. The motivation for the modification is to have the interface in order to provide communication between different communication entities.

Hansen in view of Schindler further fails to teach “the processor is responsive to a command provided via the user interface to retrieve the DTMF tones from the storage device”. McNutt teaches commands provided via telephone interface to retrieve message from the memory (abstract; col.5, lines 51-65, col.6, lines 39-67, col.7, lines 1-5; ‘commands’ reads on the

Art Unit: 2697

claim 'the processor is responsive to a command', 'telephone interface' reads on the claim 'a user interface' and 'message from the memory' reads on the claim 'DTMF tones from the storage device'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of Schindler to allow the processor responsive to a command as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the command provided via the user interface in order to retrieve the stored message.

Hansen teaches providing the text to dial a number (fig.18; col.19, lines 65-67, col.20, lines 1-67, col.21, lines 1-67, col.22, lines 1-31; 'text' reads on the claim 'DTMF tones to the PSTN interface' and 'dial a number' reads on the claim 'initiate a telephone call').

Regarding claim 11, Hansen in view of Schindler fails to teach "a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands to the processor". McNutt teaches telephone interface for providing commands (col.6, lines 50-67; 'telephone interface' reads on the claim 'a user interface, coupled to the processor' and 'commands' reads on the claim 'user commands to the processor'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of Schindler to allow a user interface, coupled to the processor for providing user commands as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the user interface for providing user commands in order to retrieve the stored message.

Hansen in view of Schindler further in view of McNutt further fails to teach "an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN)". Tverskoy teaches an interface to a public switched telephone network (PSTN) (fig.1; col.2, lines 5-38). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of

Art Unit: 2697

Schindler further in view of McNutt to allow an interface as taught by Tverskoy. The motivation for the modification is to have the interface in order to provide communication between different communication entities.

Hansen in view of Schindler further fails to teach “a DTMF tone generator configured to translate text numbers into DTMF tones”. McNutt teaches a DTMF generator circuit to convert text into DTMF signals (abstract; col.4, lines 44-68, col.5, lines 1-30; ‘DTMF generator circuit’ reads on the claim ‘DTMF tone generator configured’, ‘convert’ reads on the claim ‘translate’ and ‘text into DTMF signals’ reads on the claim ‘text numbers into DTMF tones’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of Schindler to allow the DTMF tone generator to translate text numbers into DTMF tones as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the DTMF tone generator in order to provide the telephone number to the callee.

Hansen further teaches providing the text to dial a number (fig.18; col.19, lines 65-67, col.20, lines 1-67, col.21, lines 1-67, col.22, lines 1-31; ‘text’ reads on the claim ‘DTMF tones to the PSTN interface’ and ‘dial a number’ reads on the claim ‘initiate a telephone call’).

Hansen in view of Schindler further fails to teach “the processor is responsive to a command provided via the user interface to retrieve the text corresponding to the DTMF tones from the storage device and to provide the retrieved text to the DTMF tone generator”. McNutt teaches commands provided via telephone interface to retrieve message from the memory and to provide the retrieved message to DTMF generator circuit (abstract; col.4, lines 44-68, col.5, lines 1-30, 51-65, col.6, lines 39-67, col.7, lines 1-5; ‘commands’ reads on the claim ‘the processor is responsive to a command’, ‘telephone interface’ reads on the claim ‘a user interface’, ‘message

Art Unit: 2697

from the memory' reads on the claim 'text corresponding to the DTMF tones from the storage device' and 'DTMF generator circuit' reads on the claim 'DTMF tone generator configured'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hansen in view of Schindler to allow the processor responsive to a command as taught by McNutt. The motivation for the modification is to have the command provided via the user interface in order to retrieve the stored message to make a call.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alam Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Hofsass can be reached on (703)305-4717. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

M. E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
August 22, 2003

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

